

Date: Thu, 5 Aug 93 04:30:17 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #285
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 5 Aug 93 Volume 93 : Issue 285

Today's Topics:

 Lighten Up. (was around & around..).
 PRB-1 and the ARRL
 STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Wed, 4 Aug 1993 21:55:54 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!linus!linus.mitre.org!mitre.org!
eubanks@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Lighten Up. (was around & around..).
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Aug3.174203.9738@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>

jmaynard@nyx.cs.du.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:

> >There are simple one chip FM transmitter designs, and simple one
> >chip FM reciever designs suitable for repeater access, but we rarely
> >see such in QST. It's the same old 40 meter CW circuit instead.
> >There are simple RTTY TU designs available, but we find another
> >20 meter CW transceiver design inside. Phasing SSB is now practical
> >with easily available chips, but we find an 80 meter DC receiver
> >optimized for CW inside.
>
> Don't see interesting articles in QST? Write one!

Yes, by all means, write one yourself Gary; you've demonstrated some good ideas in
this thread and I'm sure you could write some good ones. But don't re-plow too

much of the old ground already in the ARRL Handbook (you probably don't like that one either, but it's a pretty good resource), the antenna book or lots of the others available from the League and other sources.

I think QST has a good mix of interesting info for the whole community. Gary, if you don't like contests or DXCC listings, flip past them to something else just as I do.

BTW, our club in SE Arizona (Cochise County) bought 2 sets of books at \$125 a set and donated them to libraries. It's a real bargain since the books cost lots more when purchased individually. Each ham only needs the Novice/Tech/General license book(s) long enough to pass. This way we spread the resources around the community, even to the nonham community. In addition to the two sets of books, we buy additional license manuals for smaller outlying libraries. We leave a cigar box out during meetings and hamfests to donate loose change for our book project. In this day of decreasing budgets, the librarians really appreciate the additional books.

Our next goal is a set "Now You're Talking" in every high school and jr high school in our spread-out county. (send donations to me - I'll buy a book and donate it in your name)

We circulate the ARRL's video "New World of Amateur Radio" around the communities too. The League encourages you to copy and distribute it.

Let's work together.

Vern, AA7EI, Ft Huachuca, AZ

These are my personal opinions only.

Date: Thu, 5 Aug 1993 08:03:48 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nnnpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: PRB-1 and the ARRL
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

steve@netcom.com (Steven Wilson) writes:

>In article <1993Jul22.082236.1935@nnnpd2.cxo.dec.com>, little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com
(nuts2u::little) >> So do we write our division managers and ask why PRB-1
apparently means
>> nothing to the courts and silly awards merit mentioning in an ARRL
>> bulletin?
>
>Not your "division manager" but your division Director. See page 8 of
>QST for this person's name/address/phone number.

'..

>> Tell me where to write. I'm warming up the PC now...

>

>See above!

Well I wrote about everyone I could find including my two senators, my representative, David Sumner, George Wilson, Perry Williams, my section manager, my division director, and called Chris Imlay.

To top it off the village has proposed to further restrict antennas in apparent retaliation for my petition. So roof mounted antennas would be limited to 2, no dimension exceeding 12', and not to exceed 10' in height, plus it will be retroactive and all existing antennas installations will have 6 months to come into compliance. Out of the frying pan and into fire.

Anyone know a good attorney that wants to take a pro bono case? :-(

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: 4 Aug 1993 18:08:34 -0700
From: techbook.com!techbook.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
Subject: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

8/4/93

Lucky me...NOT still waiting anymore...at last.
Dated 7/27.

NOTE:

I called the FCC turkeys on the 28th and they claimed to know nothing! Waste of time calling them. Don't bother. Either too bloody lazy to look in the computer when I asked them or they lied, or.....?

Took about 11 weeks. Approximately 1 week locally 2 weeks at the Association for Retarding Radio Licensing and 8 weeks at the FCC. All kidding, aside the ARRL does have it significantly more together than the FCC, (as it should be). The FCC appears clueless. Mine apparently hit the FCC while they were still quoting 6-8 weeks, (June 4). They quote 10-12 now. Good luck!

73's

Gene
KB6WIP

--

Those who beat their swords into plowshares
are destined to plow for those who don't.
genew@techbook.COM

Please direct flames to: genew@ucant.gethere.frmhere

Date: 4 Aug 1993 23:28:19 -0400
From: noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!news.delphi.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <[23n8kp\\$k3c@news.delphi.com](mailto:23n8kp$k3c@news.delphi.com)>, <CB857D.I7A@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<1993Aug4.200213.13193@ke4zv.uucp>
Subject : Re: Code/NoCode

gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman) writes:

>In article <CB857D.I7A@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff
Herman) writes:

>>

>> Chuck, who do you think was filling your shoes prior to the no-code
>>tech license? Do you believe that ARES and RACES are new creations?
>>Could it be possible that we see only no-code techs filling these
>>positions now because the coded licensees have left VHF in disgust,
>>and now operate only HF? Just a thought.

I'm not sure if I am the Chuck this was originally intended for, but I
will comment anyway (back to Jeff I think??).

Your question is a good one and I am not sure of the answer. It is
certainly true that ARES and RACES are not new creations. It is also true
that I have heard IN THIS NEWSGROUP that "ARES is a joke." This might
suggest that those who have been filling the shoes have gotten up and left.
Or it may also mean that the shoes have been empty for some time.

As far as operators leaving VHF in disgust, I suppose it is possible, but
I doubt it. I have been a number of places in the country and I just don't
see that much difference between operating practices on VHF and those on HF
(that aren't mandated by the difference in band characteristics).

This is not going to be a code / no-code debate. The increased number of
operators has increased the pool of potential volunteers dramatically.
The apparent fact that license class has no bearing on THE ABILITY to

communicate or the quality of the communications, I expect there will be many more cases of newer operators stepping up to lead those who are interested in public service communications and are looking for someone to lead them.

Thats enough for tonite.
Take care,
Chuck

P.S. Ask me about Hamwatch sometime....

* Chuck Daley Internet CHDALEY@delphi.com *
* KD4LXQ Compuserve 73457,3114 *

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #285
